

Application No. 10/567,050  
PU030191  
November 1, 2006  
Customer # 24498

**BEST AVAILABLE COPY**

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested. Claim 25 has been amended. Claims 1-25 are in this application and are presented for the Examiner's consideration in view of the following comments.

Claim 25 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant does not agree. However, in the interests of furthering prosecution Applicant has amended claim 25 as suggested by the Examiner. Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 25 comports with the guidelines described in MPEP §2106 with regard to a computer-readable medium.

Claims 1-6, 8, 17, 19, 21 and 22 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,697,534, issued February 24, 2004 to Tan et al. (*Tan*). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

*Tan* describes the computing of a crispening (sharpening) parameter based on local content of an image. (*Tan*, col. 1, lns. 18-19; col. 3, lns. 3-7.) Of particular note is that the crispening parameter described in *Tan* addresses a problem where "employing human judgement to adjust the sharpness of an image or series of images is frequently not practical or desireable." (*Tan*, col. 2, lns. 43-45; emphasis added.) Put differently, nowhere does *Tan* describe or suggest displaying where the filtering is being performed on the received image data.

Applicant notes that the Examiner points to various portions of *Tan* that refer to a display - but none of these portions describe or suggest displaying where the filtering is being performed on the received image data. At best, *Tan* describes displaying of the filtered image. In particular, col. 4, lns. 46-67, of *Tan* merely refers to adjusting the crispening parameter based on the display device. This is not displaying where the filtering is being performed on the received image data. Likewise, col. 5, lns. 37-42, 64-67, of *Tan* merely refers to values of selected pixels. Again, this is not displaying where the filtering is being performed on the received image data. Finally, col. 6, lns. 1-20, of *Tan*, merely refers to a "window" around pixels, i.e., the shape of the area

**BEST AVAILABLE COPY**

Application No. 10/567,050  
PU030191  
November 1, 2006  
Customer # 24498

around the pixel that is used by the crispening technique. Again, this is not displaying where the filtering is being performed on the received image data.

In contrast to *Tan*, Applicant does not claim displaying the filtered image but, instead, Applicant's independent claim 1 requires "displaying where the filtering is being performed on the received image data". As noted above, nowhere does *Tan* describe, or even suggest, displaying where the filtering is being performed. Similar requirements are found in Applicant's independent claims 8 and 25.

Turning now to Applicant's independent claim 17, this claim particularly requires "converting the at least one filter control signal to a video signal". Again, nowhere does *Tan* describe, or suggest, converting the filter control signal to a video signal. Similar requirements are found in Applicant's independent claims 19, 21 and 22.

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of independent claims 1, 8, 17, 19, 21, 22 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) has been traversed. Consequently, dependent claims 2-6, are also not anticipated by *Tan*.

Claims 7, 9-16, 18, 20, 23 and 24 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Tan* in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,949,916 issued September 7, 1999 to Chun. Applicant respectfully traverses for the reasons described above with respect to the independent claims.

As it is believed that all of the rejections set forth in the Official Action have been fully met, favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited. If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone Applicant's attorney in order to overcome any additional objections that the Examiner might have.

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 07-0832 therefor.

Application No. 10/567,050  
PU030191  
November 1, 2006  
Customer # 24498

**BEST AVAILABLE COPY**

Respectfully submitted  
Todd Martin Beazley

By   
Joseph J. Opalach  
Registration No.: 36,229  
(609) 734-6839

Patent Operations  
Thomson Licensing, Inc.  
P.O. Box 5312  
Princeton, New Jersey 08543-5312  
October 31, 2006